



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/053,488	11/02/2001	Tyler J. McKinley	P0487	3362

23735 7590 08/09/2005

DIGIMARC CORPORATION  
9405 SW GEMINI DRIVE  
BEAVERTON, OR 97008

EXAMINER

CHEN, WENPENG

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2624

DATE MAILED: 08/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/053,488

Applicant(s)

MCKINLEY ET AL.

Examiner

Wenpeng Chen

Art Unit

2624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 May 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2,4,14-24,26-30 and 32-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2,4, 14-24, 26-30, 32-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

**Examiner's responses to Applicant's remark**

1. Applicants' amendments filed on 5/23/2005 overcome the followings, set forth in paper #20041214 mailed on 12/23/2004:

- objection to abstract (paragraph 6);
- objections to specification (paragraph 7);
- rejections to Claims 2-4 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph (paragraph 9).

2. Applicants' arguments with regard to restriction of Claim 31, filed on 5/23/2005, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In the telephone conversation with Mr. Joe Meyer on 12/13/2004 a provisional election was made *without traverse* to prosecute the invention of Species 4, claims 1-4, 14-30, and 32-34. As pointed out in the recent Action, the Examiner decided to examine the following set of claims (Claims 1-4, 19-30, and 34) with any elected species, although the set may contain other patentably distinct species. Furthermore, the original Claims 31 and 4 do not recite the same scope. Therefore, the examiner's willingness of reviewing Claim 4 does not necessarily require him to examine Claim 31 at the same time. Claim 31 is again withdrawn from consideration.

3. Applicants' arguments with regard to objection to specification related to incorporation by references, filed on 5/23/2005, have been fully considered. Because segmentation is a key feature of this application as evident through many recitations in specification and claims, the incorporated segmentation processes thus represent essential

Art Unit: 2624

materials for implementing embodiments of the application. The Examiner maintains that the incorporation is improper.

4. Applicants' arguments with regard to prior-art rejections, filed on 5/23/2005, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The Examiner has thoroughly reviewed Applicants' arguments but firmly believes that the cited reference to reasonably and properly meet the claimed limitations.

a. Applicants' argument -- With regard to Claim 2, Vynne does not prioritize blocks based on the visibility criteria prior to distributing them to parallel processors.

Examiner's response -- The Examiner disagrees. In the section from column 24, line 64 to column 25, line 11 that explains Fig. 6.1, Vynne teaches selecting a subset  $U(n)$  of blocks suitable for watermarking coding. In this process, the blocks in a frame are prioritized as suitable blocks and unsuitable blocks. In the section of column 27, lines 7-18, Vynne further teaches "the blocks" are divided between different processors for watermarking. Because only suitable blocks are watermarked, "the blocks" are referred only to suitable blocks. Therefore, Vynne indeed teaches the amended limitation "distributing the prioritized segments to parallel processors."

Applicants are reminded that the Examiner is entitled to give the broadest reasonable interpretation to the language of the claims. So the Examiner considers the process of selecting suitable blocks (two-states prioritization) to be Applicants' prioritization process within the broad meaning of the term. The Examiner is not limited to Applicants' definition which is not specifically set forth in the claims. In re Tanaka et al., 193 USPQ 139, (CCPA) 1977.

b. Applicants' argument -- With regard to Claims 2 and 29-33, Hawkins fails to teach sub-dividing the media signal into segments for distribution to parallel processors.

Examiner's response -- The Examiner disagrees. As cited in column 9, lines 10-25, column 10, lines 22-61, and column 12, lines 17-39 of Hawkins, the media signal is divided based on jobs, each job is a segment of media signal.

Applicants are reminded that the Examiner is entitled to give the broadest reasonable interpretation to the language of the claims. So the Examiner considers the process of separating media signal into data segments related to job segments to be Applicants' sub-dividing process within the broad meaning of the term. The Examiner is not limited to Applicants' definition which is not specifically set forth in the claims. In re Tanaka et al., 193 USPQ 139, (CCPA) 1977.

c. Applicants' argument -- With regard to Claim 4, Vynne fails to teach; "the media signal segments are prioritized such that segments that are more likely to carry a readable watermark signal are given higher priority for the embedding operations" as set forth in claim 4. Selecting suitable blocks has nothing to do with the likelihood that those blocks will carry a readable watermark signal.

Examiner's response -- As pointed out in the cited passages of Vynne, the suitable blocks are selected based on criterion related to energy level of a block. It is clearly stated that from  $V(n)^*$  the subset  $U(n)^*$  can be extracted for extracting watermarking signal. More reliably  $U(n)^*$  are extracted, more likely those blocks will carry a readable watermark signal. The cited passage

Art Unit: 2624

in column 33 teaches another way of selecting process based on a key to make a watermark more readable under attack.

d. Applicants' argument -- With regard to Claims 14-16, Hawkins fails to the feature of Claim 14 referred in the Applicants' response. Specifically, Hawkins teaches allocation of processing resources based on cost.

Examiner's response -- The Examiner disagrees. As cited in column 10, lines 40-44 and column 12, lines 25-39 of Hawkins, the segment requested for a subsequent watermarking process depends on "cost". The "cost" is not monetary cost. It is related to requirements imposed on any processor. Hawkins' "cost" depends on data-size-dependent points that are related to the characteristic of storage facility, namely the data size cannot be larger than the storage. The storage is the maximum capacity which data can be swapped for processing. As a consequence, segmentation of data of each job (segment data) is based on a memory parameter.

e. Applicants' argument -- With regard to Claim 17, Kawaguchi fails to teach; "wherein the media signal is segmented and prioritized based on bit plan."

Examiner's response -- Kawaguchi's passage cited in the previous office action teaches that watermarking is done only on some selected bit planes. As explained above, a selection process is a prioritization process.

Art Unit: 2624

f. Applicants' argument -- With regard to Claim 18, Vynne fails to teach; "the media signal is segmented and prioritized for parallel watermark decoding operations based on probability of watermark detection".

Examiner's response -- Vynne's passage from column 22, line 22 to column 24, line 58 teaches that watermarking is based on selection of blocks and probability coding model. Therefore, the decoding of watermarking also depends on probability of watermark detection. For example, blocks are divided into groups each has power of two size for B.R.S. coding. Thus the number of blocks to be selected is based on probability of watermark detection.

g. Applicants' argument -- With regard to Claims 20 and 21, Vynne fails to teach the feature recited in the claims because each processing unit in Vynne's system performs the same embedding function in parallel.

Examiner's response -- Vynne's column 27, lines 7-18 teaches that blocks are divided and watermarked. As shown in other sections, a watermark contains a series of bits of "0" and "1". Each bit is encoded in a block. Because the bits of a watermark are distributed among the divided groups of blocks, each group has a portion of bit sequence different from that of other group. The watermark embedding in each group and therefore in each processor are thus different.

h. Applicants' argument -- With regard to Claim 23, the cited art fails to teach the claimed re-use of a perpetual mask.

Examiner's response -- The Applicants did not provide detailed reason why the Examiner's cited passages do not meet the requirement.

Art Unit: 2624

i. Applicants' argument -- With regard to Claim 34, Shinoda fails to teach any form of a batch watermark registration and embedding system.

Examiner's response -- As cited by the Examiner, Shinoda at least teaches processing Web *pages* including watermarking in column 3, lines 7-50. Shinoda processes the group of Web pages one at a time within a job. As long as, the pages are grouped as a job, it is a batch of files. The process for the Web pages is considered a batch watermarking process. Each page of the group is then segmented and watermarked in parallel as taught by Vynne.

Applicants are reminded that the Examiner is entitled to give the broadest reasonable interpretation to the language of the claims.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Art Unit: 2624

6. Claims 2, 4, 18-24, and 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Vynne et al. (US patent 5,960,081.)

a. Please also see the Examiner's responses above.

b. Vynne teaches a method of segmenting a media signal for parallel watermarking operations, the method comprising

for Claim 2

-- sub-dividing the media signal into segments, including analyzing the media signal to prioritize segments of the media signal for digital watermark operations on the segments, wherein the media signal segments are prioritized for digital watermark embedding operations; (column 24, line 65 to column 25, line 11; Fig. 6.1; column 27, lines 7-18; The images are divided into blocks. A subset  $U(n)$  of blocks suitable for coding is selected using the selection criteria discussed from column 17, line 54 to column 22, line 21. The selection process is a prioritization process.)

-- distributing the prioritized segments to parallel processors; (Fig. 7.2; column 26, line 1 to column 27, line 18; Fig. 7.2 shows the parallel processors. A group of  $B_{pe}$  blocks is sent to each processor.)

-- performing parallel digital watermark operations on the segments in the parallel processors; (column 10, lines 32-48; Fig. 7.2; column 26, line 1 to column 27, line 18)

for Claim 4

Art Unit: 2624

-- sub-dividing the media signal into segments; (Fig. 6.1; column 27, lines 7-18; The images are divided into blocks.)

-- distributing the segments to parallel processors; (Fig. 7.2; column 26, line 1 to column 27, line 18; Fig. 7.2 shows the parallel processors. A group of  $B_{pe}$  blocks is sent to each processor.)

-- performing parallel digital watermark operations on the segments in the parallel processors: including analyzing the media signal to prioritize segments of the media signal for digital watermark operations on the segments, wherein the media signal segments are prioritized for digital watermark embedding operations and wherein the media signal segments are prioritized such that segments that are more likely to carry a readable watermark signal are given higher priority for the embedding operations; (column 10, lines 32-48; Fig. 7.2; column 26, line 1 to column 27, line 18; column 24, line 65 to column 25, line 11; Fig. 6.1; column 27, lines 7-18; The images are divided into blocks. A subset  $U(n)$  of blocks suitable for coding is selected using the selection criteria discussed from column 17, line 54 to column 22, line 21. The selection process is a prioritization process. column 8, lines 25-35; The blocks are selected based on energy of a block to generate more-likely readable watermark signal.; column 33, lines 19-23; The blocks can be selected also based on a secret key to generate more-likely readable watermark signal, when the watermark is under attack.)

for Claims 18-19

-- sub-dividing the media signal into segments; (Fig. 6.1; column 27, lines 7-18; The images are divided into blocks.)

Art Unit: 2624

-- distributing the segments to parallel processors; (Fig. 7.2; column 26, line 1 to column 27, line 18; Fig. 7.2 shows the parallel processors. A group of  $B_{pe}$  blocks is sent to each processor.)

-- performing parallel digital watermark operations on the segments in the parallel processors (column 10, lines 32-48; Fig. 7.2; column 26, line 1 to column 27, line 18) wherein the media signal is segmented and prioritized for parallel watermark decoding operations based on probability of watermark detection; (column 22, line 22 to column 24, line 58)

-- wherein the parallel processors comprise threads of execution on one or more hardware processing units; (column 26, lines 57-68; Each segment is processed separately and then combined.)

for Claims 20-21

-- sub-dividing the media signal into segments; (Fig. 6.1; column 27, lines 7-18; The images are divided into blocks.)

-- distributing the segments to parallel processors; (Fig. 7.2; column 26, line 1 to column 27, line 18; Fig. 7.2 shows the parallel processors. A group of  $B_{pe}$  blocks is sent to each processor.)

-- performing parallel digital watermark operations on the segments in the parallel processors (column 10, lines 32-48; Fig. 7.2; column 26, line 1 to column 27, line 18) wherein the watermark operations are performed by two or more watermark operation modules that perform a different watermarking task, and the watermark operation modules operate in parallel such that a watermarking task for the media signal is distributed over the watermark operation modules performing different watermark functions on the media signal in parallel; (Fig. 7.2;

Art Unit: 2624

column 10, lines 32-48; Fig. 7.2; column 26, line 1 to column 27, line 18; Also see the above Examiner's responses.)

-- wherein the watermark operation modules comprise a watermark generator, a perceptual analyzer and a watermark applicator. (Fig. 6.1; The part generating the signature is a watermark generator. "Criteria 612" is a perceptual analyzer. Embedder 618 is a watermark applicator. Each PE of Fig. 7.2 has the set shown in Fig. 6.1.)

c. For Claim 22, Vynne further teaches computer readable medium on which is stored instructions for performing the method of claim 20. (column 26, lines 1-54; column 27, lines 27-58; The instructions are stored in memory inside CRAY computer.)

d. Vynne teaches a distributed digital watermark embedder comprising:

for Claims 23-24 and 26-28

-- a watermark signal generator for generating a watermark from a message; (column 1, lines 43-51; Fig. 6.1; column 9, lines 45-59; The part generating the signature is a watermark generator. The signature is related with author of a document or other information which is a message. The final watermark is generated from the signature.)

-- a perceptual analyzer for perceptually analyzing a media signal and generating perceptual control parameters used to control application of the watermark to the media signal; (Fig. 6.1; "Criteria 612" is a perceptual analyzer. A subset  $U(n)$  of blocks suitable for coding is selected using the selection criteria based on perceptual analysis discussed from column 17, line 54 to column 22, line 21.)

Art Unit: 2624

-- a watermark applicator for receiving the media signal, the watermark and the perceptual control parameters, and for applying the watermark to the media signal according to the perceptual control parameters; wherein the watermark signal generator, the perceptual analyzer and the watermark applicator operate on distributed processors, wherein the distributed processors comprises independent threads of execution (Fig. 6.1; Fig. 7.2; column 10, lines 32-48; Fig. 7.2; column 26, line 1 to column 27, line 18; Embedder 618 is a watermark applicator. Each PE of Fig. 7.2 has the set shown in Fig. 6.1.) wherein variable watermarks are embedded in copies of a media signal by executing the perceptual analyzer on the media signal once to generate a perceptual mask that is re-used by the watermark applicator to apply different watermarks from the watermark signal generator to the copies; (column 17, line 54 to column 22, line 22; column 27, line 59 to column 28, line 10; The criteria thresholds as those listed in column 22, lines 1-9 are the mask that is used for selecting blocks for watermarking. The thresholds are adjusted based on perceptual analysis through direct view.)

-- including a media signal segmentation processor for sub-dividing a media signal into segments for parallel processing in the embedder, wherein the embedder includes plural perceptual analyzers, which operate in parallel on segments of the media signal and wherein the embedder includes plural watermark signal applicators, which operate in parallel on segments of the media signal. (Figs. 6.1 and 7.2; column 27, lines 7-18; The images are divided into blocks. The part generating the signature is a watermark generator. "Criteria 612" is a perceptual analyzer. Embedder 618 is a watermark applicator. Each PE of Fig. 7.2 has the set shown in Fig. 6.1. )

Art Unit: 2624

7. Claims 2, 14-15, 20, 22, 29-30 and 32-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hawkins et al. (US patent 6,389,421.)

a. Please also see the Examiner's responses above.

b. Hawkins teaches a method of segmenting a media signal for parallel watermarking operations, the method comprising:

for Claim 2

-- sub-dividing the media signal into segments, including analyzing the media signal to prioritize segments of the media signal for digital watermark operations on the segments, wherein the media signal segments are prioritized for digital watermark embedding operations; (column 9, lines 10-25; column 10, lines 22-61; column 12, lines 17-39; The media signal is divided based on jobs.; column 10, lines 4-62; The segments are prioritized based on the user of the media signal to set a schedule.)

-- distributing the prioritized segments to parallel processors; (column 6, lines 26-34; column 12, lines 17-39; A single number of watermarking process is assigned per available processor.)

-- performing parallel digital watermark operations on the segments in the parallel processors; (column 6, lines 26-358; column 12, lines 17-39; A single number of watermarking process is assigned per available processor.)

for Claims 14-15

Art Unit: 2624

-- sub-dividing the media signal into segments; (column 9, lines 10-25; column 10, lines 22-61; column 12, lines 17-39; The media signal is divided based on jobs.)

-- distributing the segments to parallel processors; (column 6, lines 26-34; column 12, lines 17-39; A single number of watermarking process is assigned per available processor.)

-- performing parallel digital watermark operations on the segments in the parallel processors (column 6, lines 26-358; column 12, lines 17-39; A single number of watermarking process is assigned per available processor.) wherein the media signal is segmented into blocks based on a memory parameter of processing hardware, and the memory parameter comprises a unit of memory used to swap data into system memory in a virtual memory system; (column 10, lines 40-44; column 12, lines 25-39; The segment requested for a subsequent watermarking process depends on data-size-dependent points that is related to the characteristic of storage facility, namely the data size cannot be larger than the storage. The storage is the maximum capacity which data can be swapped for processing.)

for Claim 20

-- sub-dividing the media signal into segments; (column 9, lines 10-25; column 10, lines 22-61; column 12, lines 17-39; The media signal is divided based on jobs.)

-- distributing the segments to parallel processors; (column 6, lines 26-34; column 12, lines 17-39; A single number of watermarking process is assigned per available processor.)

-- performing parallel digital watermark operations on the segments in the parallel processors (column 6, lines 26-358; column 12, lines 17-39; A single number of watermarking process is assigned per available processor.) wherein the watermark operations are performed by two or more watermark operation modules that perform a different watermarking task, and the

Art Unit: 2624

watermark operation modules operate in parallel such that a watermarking task for the media signal is distributed over the watermark operation modules performing different watermark functions on the media signal in parallel. (column 6, lines 26-58; column 12, lines 17-39; A single number of watermarking process is assigned per available processor. Also see the above Examiner's responses.)

c. For Claim 22, Hawkins further teaches computer readable medium on which is stored instructions for performing the method of claim 20. (See claim 20 of Hawkins)

d. For Claims 29-30 and 32-33, Hawkins teaches a system for parallel watermark embedding comprising:

-- a media signal pre-processor operable to receive a media signal and divide the media signal into segments for parallel watermark embedding operations; (column 9, lines 10-25; column 10, lines 22-61; column 12, lines 17-39; The media signal is divided based on jobs.)

-- a server for distributing the segments to parallel processors for parallel watermark embedding operations; (column 6, lines 26-58; column 12, lines 17-39; A single number of watermarking process is assigned per available processor.)

-- wherein the segments are prioritized for embedding operations, wherein the segments are prioritized for embedding operations based on hardware resource constraints; (column 10, lines 4-62; column 11, lines 12-26; The segments are prioritized based on a schedule. The worker thread is performed based on a resource allocation schedule which indicates hardware resource constraints.)

Art Unit: 2624

-- a load balancer for distributing segments to the parallel processors based on priority.  
(column 10, lines 4-62; column 11, lines 12-26; The segments are prioritized based on a schedule. The load balance is based on points allocated to users or size of data.)

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hawkins et al. (US patent 6,389,421) as applied to Claim 14, and further in view of Peters et al. (US patent 6,374,336.)

Hawkins teaches the parent Claim 14. However, it does not teach the feature related to memory alignment boundary recited in Claim 16.

Peters teaches a method of watermarking:

-- wherein segmenting signals based on a memory parameter that comprises a memory alignment boundary. (column 10, lines 7-30)

It is desirable to process image at the correct division of data to reduce loss or degradation of data. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of

Art Unit: 2624

the invention, to apply Peters' teaching to segment Hawkins' data based on memory alignment boundary, because the combination preserves better data quality.

10. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vynne et al. (US patent 5,960,081) in view of Kawaguchi et al. (US patent 6,473,516.)

Vynne teaches the steps of sub-dividing, distributing, and performing recited in Claim 17, as evident in the discussion above related to Claim 4.

However, it does not teach the feature related to bit planes recited in Claim 17.

Kawaguchi teaches a method of steganography which is watermarking:

-- wherein a media signal is segmented and prioritized based on bit plane to reduce the number of bit planes of the media signal subjected to watermarking operations. (column 2, lines 32-40; column 5, lines 26-37; Watermarking is done only on some bit planes.)

It is desirable to increase information hiding capacity in watermarking. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to include Kawaguchi's segmentation and prioritization method in Vynne's watermarking method, because the combination improves information hiding capacity.

11. Claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shinoda (US 6,611,830) in view of Vynne et al. (US patent 5,960,081.)

Shinoda teaches a batch digital watermark registration and embedding system comprising:

Art Unit: 2624

-- a network interface for receiving ID registration requests, the requests including a list of media signal files and information to be linked with the media signal files via data embedded in the media signal files; (Fig. 1; column 1, lines 40-46; column 3, lines 7-50; column 5, lines 1-35; Many files, each having an ID, are inputted at least one by one for registration.)

-- a batch registration loader for creating records in a registration database corresponding to identifiers for each of the media signal files; (column 4, line 64 to column 5, line 35; Fig. 5 shows records in the database.)

-- a batch registration extractor for reading the registration database and creating an embedder control file, including identifiers, a corresponding list of media signal files, and embedding instructions for controlling embedding of the identifiers in the media signal files; (column 4, line 64 to column 5, line 35)

-- a digital watermark embedder for performing digital watermark embedding operations on each file to hide the identifiers in the media signal files. (column 4, line 64 to column 5, line 46)

However, Shinoda does not teach the feature related to parallel digital water embedding.

Vynne teaches a system of segmenting a media signal for parallel watermarking operations, comprising:

-- sub-dividing the media signal into segments; (Fig. 6.1; column 27, lines 7-18; The images are divided into blocks.)

-- distributing the segments to parallel processors; (Fig. 7.2; column 26, line 1 to column 27, line 18; Fig. 7.2 shows the parallel processors. A group of  $B_{pe}$  blocks is sent to each processor.)

Art Unit: 2624

-- performing parallel digital watermark operations on the segments in the parallel processors. (column 10, lines 32-48; Fig. 7.2; column 26, line 1 to column 27, line 18)

It is desirable to speed up watermarking of data files. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to use Vynne's parallel watermarking approach in Shinoda's system to perform parallel watermarking for a set of files, because the combination speeds up watermarking and therefore registration process. The combination thus teaches:

-- a parallel digital watermark embedder for segmenting media signal files into segments and for distributing the segments to parallel processors for performing parallel digital watermark embedding operations on the segments to hide the identifiers in the media signal files.

### **Conclusion**

12. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). The Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for response to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the date of this action. In the event a first response is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event will the statutory period for response expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2624

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wenpeng Chen whose telephone number is 571-272-7431. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David K Moore can be reached on 571-272-7437. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 571-273-8300 for regular communications and 571-273-8300 for After Final communications. TC 2600's customer service number is 571-272-2600.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2600.

Wenpeng Chen  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2624

August 4, 2005

